HATCHERY AND GENETIC MANAGEMENT PLAN (HGMP)

Hatchery Program:	Kendall Creek Coho Program
Species or Hatchery Stock:	Coho (*Onchorynchus kisutch*) Kendall Creek
Agency/Operator:	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Watershed and Region:	Nooksack River Puget Sound
Date Submitted:	March 17, 2003
Date Last Updated:	January 23, 2003

SECTION 1. GENERAL PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

1.1) Name of hatchery or program.

Kendall Creek Coho Program.

1.2) Species and population (or stock) under propagation, and ESA status.

Kendall Creek Coho (*Onchorynchus kisutch*) - not listed

1.3) Responsible organization and individuals

Name (and title):	Chuck Phillips, Region 4 Fish Program Manager Ted Thygesen, Nooksack Complex Manager	
Agency or Tribe:	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	
Address:	600 Capitol Way North, Olympia, Wa. 98501-1091	
Telephone:	(425) 775-1311 Ext 120	(360) 676-2138
Fax:	(425) 338-1066	(360) 738-6291
Email:	**phillcep@dfw.wa.gov**	**thygetlt@dfw.wa.gov**

Other agencies, Tribes, co-operators, or organizations involved, including contractors, and extent of involvement in the program:

Whatcom Creek Hatchery, (for the Squalicum Net Pens), Ferndale High School, Lynden Christian High School, Nooksack Regional Fish Enhancement Group, and WDFW's Classroom Aquarium program all receive fish or eggs from the Kendall Creek Coho program.

1.4) Funding source, staffing level, and annual hatchery program operational costs.

Funding for this program is provided by the State General Fund

1.5) Location(s) of hatchery and associated facilities.

Kendall Creek Hatchery: On Kendall Creek (01.0406) at the confluence with NF Nooksack River (01.0120) @ RM 46.

1.6) Type of program

Integrated harvest

1.7) Purpose (Goal) of program

Augmentation

The goal of this program is provide fish for harvest. This program was reduced from a release of 1,000,000 yearling smolts (2,000,000 including fry plants) to 300,000 yearling smolts starting with the 1996 brood year (1998 release).

1.8) Justification for the program.

This program will be operated to provide fish for harvest while minimizing adverse effects on listed fish. This will be accomplished in the following manner:

1. Release coho as smolts with expected brief freshwater residence.

2. Time of release not to coincide with out-migration of listed fish.

3. Only appropriate stock will be propagated.

4. Mark all hatchery reared fish.

5. Hatchery fish will be propagated using appropriate fish culture methods and consistent with Co-Managers Fish Health Policy and state and federal water quality standards; e.g. NPDES criteria.

1.9) List of program Performance Standards .

See section 1.10.

1.10) List of program Performance Indicators , designated by "benefits" and "risks."

Performance Standards and Indicators for Puget Sound **Integrated Harvest** Coho programs.

Performance Standard	Performance Indicator	Monitoring and Evaluation Plan
Produce adult fish for harvest	Survival and contribution rates	Monitor catch and measure survivals by periodical CWT data. (if available)
Meet hatchery production goals	Number of juvenile fish released - **300,000**	Estimating number of fish planted (weighing / counting fish), monitoring proximity to hatchery production goals, number released recorded on hatchery divisions "plant reports", data available on WDFW data base. Future Brood Documents.
Manage for adequate escapement	Hatchery and wild return rates Catch rates	Monitoring hatchery/wild return rates through trapping (at the hatchery or at weir), live fish counts in index areas on the spawning grounds plus catch records.

Minimize interactions with listed fish through proper broodstock management	Total number of broodstock collected - **706-883**	Measuring number of fish actually spawned and killed to meet egg take goal at the hatchery. Hatchery Records.
	Sex ratios	Hatchery Records, Spawning guidelines
	Timing of adult collection/spawning - **October to early December**	Start trapping prior to historical start of the run, continue trapping throughout the run, dates and times are recorded on hatchery divisions "adult reports", data available on WDFW data base.
	Number of listed fish passed upstream - **0**	
	Hatchery stray rate	CWT data and spawning ground surveys Hatchery records
	Number wild fish used in broodstock - **Unknown**	
	Return timing of wild /hatchery adults - **April thru early September (chinook)/Oct-early Dec for coho**	Hatchery records Hatchery records Spawning guidelines
	Adherence to spawning guidelines - **see section 8.3**	

Minimize interactions with listed fish through proper rearing and release strategies	Juveniles released as smolts	Future Brood Document (FBD) and hatchery records Hatchery records and historical natural out-migrant data
	Outmigration timing of listed fish / hatchery fish - **April thru June (chinook) /mid-late May (coho)**	FBD and hatchery records
	Size and time of release - **17 fpp/mid - late May release**	CWT data and mark / unmarked ratios of adults
Maintain stock integrity and genetic diversity	Effective population size	Spawning guidelines
	Hatchery-Origin Recruit spawners	Spawning ground surveys
Maximize in-hatchery survival of broodstock and their progeny; and Limit the impact of pathogens associated with hatchery stocks, on listed fish	Fish pathologists will monitor the health of hatchery stocks on a monthly basis and recommend preventative actions / strategies to maintain fish health	Co-Managers Disease Policy Fish Health monitoring records
	Fish pathologists will diagnose fish health problems and minimize their impact	
	Vaccines will be administered when appropriate to protect fish health	

	A fish health database will be maintained to identify trends in fish health and disease and implement fish health management plans based on findings	
	Fish health staff will present workshops on fish health issues to provide continuing education to hatchery staff.	
Ensure hatchery operations comply with state and federal water quality standards through proper environmental monitoring	NPDES compliance	Monthly NPDES records

1.11) Expected size of program.

1.11.1) Proposed annual broodstock collection level (maximum number of adult fish).

The average fecundity of coho females returning to Kendall Creek Hatchery is 1,700 eggs. The normal male to female ratio ranges between 50:50 and 60:40, which would result in 706 to 883 adult coho needed for the program.

1.11.2) Proposed annual fish release levels (maximum number) by life stage and location.

Life Stage	Release Location	Annual Release Level
Eyed Eggs		
Unfed Fry		
Fry		
Fingerling		
Yearling	Nooksack River (01.0120)	300,000

*- Since the 1995 BY, the program has been reduced from a 2,000,000 release (including fry plants) to the present 300,000 release.

**- 77,000 eggs transferred to various schools and co-ops in area with resultant unfed fry planted in various streams in watershed and independent streams.

***- 100,000 eggs transferred to Lynden Christian High School with resultant fed fry planted in Fish Trap Creek.

****- 5,000 fish are transferred to Squalicum Harbor Net Pens for rearing and release (see Whatcom Creek coho HGMP).

1.12) Current program performance, including estimated smolt-to-adult survival rates, adult production levels, and escapement levels. Indicate the source of these data.

For broodyears 1991 through 1998, smolt-to-adult survivals have ranged from .9% to 6.8% with an average of 2.5%. For broodyears spanning broodyears 1988 through 1997, the average survival was 4.6%. The hatchery escapement levels from 1995 through 2001 have been 7,565, 15,988, 12,909, 7,107, 2,631, 2,950 and 8,177, respectively.

1.13) Date program started (years in operation), or is expected to start.

1950

1.14) Expected duration of program.

Ongoing

1.15) Watersheds targeted by program.

NF Nooksack River (01.0120)

1.16) Indicate alternative actions considered for attaining program goals, and reasons why those actions are not being proposed.

None.

SECTION 2. PROGRAM EFFECTS ON ESA-LISTED SALMONID POPULATIONS.

2.1) List all ESA permits or authorizations in hand for the hatchery program.

None

2.2) Provide descriptions, status, and projected take actions and levels for ESA-listed natural populations in the target area.

2.2.1) Description of ESA-listed salmonid population(s) affected by the program.

- Identify the ESA-listed population(s) that will be directly affected by the program.

None

- Identify the ESA-listed population(s) that may be incidentally affected by the program.

Puget Sound Chinook and Bull Trout/Dolly Varden. Three stocks of chinook are identified in the Nooksack basin. They are North Fork Nooksack Chinook, South Fork Nooksack Chinook, and Samish, Mainstem Nooksack Fall Chinook. The first two are of native origin and the health of the populations as per SASSI is considered critical . The third is an introduced hatchery stock. Its status is unknown .

Native chinook enter the Nooksack from April through early September. Spawning occurs in August and September. Outmigration of juveniles occurs in the spring.

Three stocks of native char have been identified in the Nooksack basin. These are the Lower Nooksack, Canyon Creek and Upper Middle Fork stocks. The latter is isolated from the rest of the basin due to a diversion dam. The USFWS is supportive of laddering the dam to provide passage. Char exhibit anadromous, fluvial, and resident life histories. Spawning occurs in the fall. After spawning, anadromous adults move downriver and enter the estuary during the spring while fluvial adults disperse throughout the upper river. Sub-adults may also enter the river from the estuary in late winter and early spring. Adults return to spawning staging areas in late summer.

There are no data on char population sizes and the status of the stocks is unknown.

2.2.2) Status of ESA-listed salmonid population(s) affected by the program.

- **Describe the status of the listed natural population(s) relative to critical and viable population thresholds** (*see definitions in Attachment 1").*

Critical and viable population thresholds under ESA have not been determined yet, however, the SASSI report determined that the NF and SF chinook are "critical". Dolly Varden/Bull Trout are "unknown".

- Provide the most recent 12 year (e.g. 1988-present) progeny-to-parent ratios, survival data by life-stage, or other measures of productivity for the listed population. Indicate the source of these data.

For the North Fork, wild / hatchery ratio for 1995 to 1999 = .31:1 average (range 3.3:1 to .11:1). The recruit / spawner ratio range for 1995 to 1999 = .00000 to .53333 fish per spawner.

There is limited data for the South Fork wild/hatchery ratios in these categories (Pete Castle, Area Biologist, WDFW).

- Provide the most recent 12 year (e.g. 1988-1999) annual spawning abundance estimates, or any other abundance information. Indicate the source of these data.

ESTIMATED ESCAPEMENT OF NOOKSACK CHINOOK STOCKS

YEAR	SOUTH FORK CHINOOK	NORTH FORK CHINOOK
1984	188	45
1985	445	255
1986	170	224
1987	248	179
1988	233	452
1989	606	300
1990	142	10
1991	365	107
1992	103	493
1993	235	445
1994	118	45
1995	290	230
1996	203	535
1997	180	617
1998	157	370
1999	213	892

Note: In 1999 and 2000, 55.6% and 32.4%, respectively, of the carcasses surveyed in the SF Nooksack were strays from the NF Nooksack Kendall stock rebuilding program (Ned Currance, Nooksack tribal biologist, personal communication).

- Provide the most recent 12 year (e.g. 1988-1999) estimates of annual proportions of direct hatchery-origin and listed natural-origin fish on natural spawning grounds, if known.

North Fork Nooksack River Spring Chinook 1995-2000

Year	Overall Escapement	Number of natural-origin
1995	230	175
1996	535	210
1997	617	121
1998	370	39
1999	892	91
2000	1242	157

(As noted above, there has been documentation of NF Nooksack Kendall stock being found in the SF Nooksack.. WDFW acknowledges the problem and will work with NMFS and the tribes to address it).

2.2.3) <u>Describe hatchery activities, including associated monitoring and evaluation and research programs, that may lead to the take of listed fish in the target area, and provide estimated annual levels of take</u>.
- Describe hatchery activities that may lead to the take of listed salmonid populations in the target area, including how, where, and when the takes may occur, the risk potential for their occurrence, and the likely effects of the take.

The release of fish as described in this HGMP could potentially result in ecological interactions with listed species. These potential ecological interactions are discussed in Section 3.5, and risk control measures are discussed in Section 10.11. Implementation of the program modifications provided in this HGMP, and the actions previously taken by the comanagers, are anticipated to contribute to the continued improvement in the abundance of listed salmonids.

Collection of steelhead broodstock takes place between December and early March oustide the return time of the spring, summer and fall chinook runs. No likely effects to "take" of listed chinook.

- **Provide information regarding past takes associated with the hatchery program, (if known) including numbers taken, and observed injury or mortality levels for listed fish**.

Unknown

- **Provide projected annual take levels for listed fish by life stage (juvenile and adult) quantified (to the extent feasible) by the type of take resulting from the hatchery program (e.g. capture, handling, tagging, injury, or lethal take).**

See "take" table at end of HGMP

- Indicate contingency plans for addressing situations where take levels within a given year have exceeded, or are projected to exceed, take levels described in this plan for the program.

None

SECTION 3. RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAM TO OTHER MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVES

3.1) Describe alignment of the hatchery program with any ESU-wide hatchery plan (e.g. *Hood Canal Summer Chum Conservation Initiative*) or other regionally accepted policies (e.g. the NPPC *Annual Production Review* Report and Recommendations - NPPC document 99-15). Explain any proposed deviations from the plan or policies.

None.

3.2) List all existing cooperative agreements, memoranda of understanding, memoranda of agreement, or other management plans or court orders under which program operates.

Puget Sound Salmon Management Plan (1985)

3.3) Relationship to harvest objectives.

3.3.1) Describe fisheries benefitting from the program, and indicate harvest levels and rates for program-origin fish for the last twelve years (1988-99), if available.

These fish contribute to all west coast Vancouver Island, Strait of Juan de Fuca and northern Puget Sound coho commercial and recreational fisheries, including coastal troll, strait recreational, Bellingham bay net and area 7 sport. Overall harvest levels have consistently exceeded an 80% exploitation rate for last twelve years.

3.4) Relationship to habitat protection and recovery strategies.

The comanagers resource management plans for artificial production in Puget Sound are expected to be one component of a recovery plan for Puget Sound chinook under development through the Shared Strategy process. Several important analyses have been completed, including the identification of populations of Puget Sound chinook, but further development of the plan may result in an improved understanding of the habitat, harvest, and hatchery actions required for recovery of Puget Sound chinook.

3.5) Ecological interactions.

The program described in this HGMP interacts with the biotic and abiotic components of the freshwater, estuarine, and marine salmonid ecosystem through a complex web of short and longterm processes. The complexity of this web means that secondary or tertiary interactions (both positive and negative) with listed species could occur in multiple time periods, and that evaluation of the net effect can be difficult. WDFW is not aware of any studies that have directly evaluated the ecological effects of this program. Alternatively, we provide in this section a brief summary of empirical information and theoretical analyses of three types of ecological interactions, nutrient enhancement,

predation, and competition, that may be relevant to this program. Recent reviews by Fresh (1997), Flagg et al. (2000), and Stockner (2003) can be consulted for additional information; NMFS (2002) provides an extensive review and application to ESA permitting of artificial production programs.

Nutrient Enhancement

Adults originating from this program that return to natural spawning areas may provide a source of nutrients in oligotrohic coastal river systems and stimulate stream productivity. Many watersheds in the Pacific Northwest appear to be nutrient-limited (Gregory et al. 1987; Kline et al. 1997) and salmonid carcasses can be an important source of marine derived nutrients (Levy 1997). Carcasses from returning adult salmon have been found to elevate stream productivity through several pathways, including: 1) the releases of nutrients from decaying carcasses has been observed to stimulate primary productivity (Wipfli et al. 1998); 2) the decaying carcasses have been found to enrich the food base of aquatic invertebrates (Mathisen et al. 1988); and 3) juvenile salmonids have been observed to feed directly on the carcasses (Bilby et al. 1996). Addition of nutrients has been observed to increase the production of salmonids (Slaney and Ward 1993; Slaney et al. 2003; Ward et al. 2003).

Predation Freshwater Environment

Coho and steelhead released from hatchery programs may prey upon listed species of salmonids, but the magnitude of predation will depend upon the characteristic of the listed population of salmonids, the habitat in which the population occurs, and the characteristics of the hatchery program (e.g., release time, release location, number released, and size of fish released). The site specific nature of predation, and the limited number of empirical studies that have been conducted, make it difficult to predict the predation effects of any specific hatchery program. WDFW is unaware of any studies that have empirically estimated the predation risks to listed species posed by the program described in this HGMP.

In the absence of site-specific empirical information, the identification of risk factors can be a useful tool for reviewing hatchery programs while monitoring and research programs are developed and implemented. Risk factors for evaluating the potential for significant predation include the following:

Environmental Characteristics. Water clarity and temperature, channel size and configuration, and river flow are among the environmental characteristics that can influence the likelihood that predation will occur (see SWIG (1984) for a review). The SIWG (1984) concluded that the potential for predation is greatest in small streams with flow and turbidity conditions conducive to high visibility.

Relative Body Size. The potential for predation is limited by the relative body size of fish released from the program and the size of prey. Generally, salmonid predators are thought to prey on fish approximately 1/3 or less their length (USFWS 1994), although coho salmon have been observed to consume juvenile chinook salmon of up to 46% of their total length (Pearsons et al. 1998). The

lengths of juvenile migrant chinook salmon originating from natural production have been monitored in numerous watersheds throughout Puget Sound, including the Skagit River , Stillaguamish River, Bear Creek, Cedar River, Green River, Puyallup River, and Dungeness River. The average size of migrant chinook salmon is typically 40mm or less in February and March, but increases in the period from April through June as emergence is completed and growth commences (Table 3.5.1). Assuming that the prey item can be no greater than 1/3 the length of the predator, Table 3.5.1 can be used to determine the length of predator required to consume a chinook salmon of average length in each time period. The increasing length of natural origin juvenile chinook salmon from March through June indicates that delaying the release hatchery smolts of a fixed size will reduce the risks associated with predation.

Table 3.5.1. Average length by statistical week of natural origin juvenile chinook salmon migrants captured in traps in Puget Sound watersheds. The minimum predator length corresponding to the average length of chinook salmon migrants, assuming that the prey can be no greater than 1/3 the length of the predator, are provided in the final row of the table. (NS: not sampled.)

Watershed	Statistical Week										
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Skagit [1] 1997-2001	43.2	48.3	50.6	51.7	56.1	59.0	58.0	60.3	61.7	66.5	68.0
Stillaguamish [2] 2001-2002	51.4	53.5	55.7	57.8	60.0	62.1	64.2	66.4	68.5	70.6	72.8
Cedar [3] 1998-2000	54.9	64.2	66.5	70.2	75.3	77.5	80.7	85.5	89.7	99.0	113
Green [4] 2000	52.1	57.2	59.6	63.1	68.1	69.5	NS	79.0	82.4	79.4	76.3
Puyallup [5] 2002	NS	NS	NS	66.2	62.0	70.3	73.7	72.7	78.7	80.0	82.3
Dungeness [6] 1996-1997	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	77.9	78.8	81.8
All Systems Average Length	50.4	55.8	58.1	61.8	64.3	67.7	69.2	72.8	76.5	79.0	82.4
Minimum Predator Length	153	169	176	187	195	205	210	221	232	239	250

Sources:

[1] Data are from Seiler et al. (1998); Seiler et al. (1999); Seiler et al. (2000); Seiler et al. (2001), and Seiler et al. (2002)..

[2] Data are from regression models presented in Griffith et al. (2001) and Griffith et al. (2003).

[3] Data are from Seiler et al. (2003).

[4] Data are from Seiler et. (2002).
[5] Data are from Samarin and Sebastian (2002).
[6] Data are from Marlowe et al. (2001).

Date of Release. The release date of juvenile fish for the program can influence the likelihood that listed species are encountered or are of a size that is small enough to be consumed. The most extensive studies of the migration timing of naturally produced juvenile chinook salmon in the Puget Sound ESU have been conducted in the Skagit River, Bear Creek, Cedar River, and the Green River. Although distinct differences are evident in the timing of migration between watersheds, several general patterns are beginning to emerge:

1) Emigration occurs over a prolonged period, beginning soon after enough emergence (typically January) and continuing at least until July;
2) Two broad peaks in migration are often present during the January through July time period; an early season peak (typically in March) comprised of relatively small chinook salmon (40-45mm), and a second peak in mid-May to June comprised of larger chinook salmon;
3) On average, over 80% of the juvenile chinook have migrated past the trapping locations after statistical week 23 (usually occurring in the first week of June).

Table 3.5.2. Average cumulative proportion of the total number of natural origin juvenile chinook salmon migrants estimated to have migrated past traps in Puget Sound watersheds.

Watershed	Statistical Week										
	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26
Skagit [1] 1997-2001	0.61	0.64	0.68	0.73	0.76	0.78	0.83	0.86	0.90	0.92	0.94
Bear [2] 1999-2000	0.26	0.27	0.28	0.32	0.41	0.52	0.73	0.84	0.92	0.96	0.97
Cedar [2] 1999-2000	0.76	0.76	.0.76	0.77	0.79	0.80	0.82	0.84	0.87	0.88	0.90
Green [3] 2000	0.63	0.63	0.64	0.69	0.77	0.79	0.84	0.86	0.88	0.98	1.00
All Systems Average	0.56	0.58	0.59	0.63	0.68	0.72	0.80	0.85	0.89	0.94	0.95

Sources:
[1] Data are from Seiler et al. (1998); Seiler et al. (1999); Seiler et al. (2000); Seiler et al. (2001), and Seiler et al. (2002)..
[2] Data are from Seiler et al. (2003).
[3] Data are from Seiler et. (2002).

Release Location and Release Type. The likelihood of predation may also be affected by the location and type of release. Other factors being equal, the risk of predation may increase with the length of time the fish released from the artificial production program are commingled with the listed species. In the freshwater environment, this is likely to be affected by distribution of the listed species in the watershed, the location of the release, and the speed at which fish released from the program migrate from the watershed.

Coho salmon and steelhead released from western Washington artificial production programs as smolts have typically been found to migrate rapidly downstream. Data from Seiler et al. (1997; 2000) indicate that coho smolts released from the Marblemount Hatchery on the Skagit River migrate approximately 11.2 river miles day. Steelhead smolts released onstation may travel even more rapidly migration rates of approximately 20 river miles per day have been observed in the Cowlitz River (Harza 1998). However, trucking fish to offstation release sites, particularly release sites located outside of the watershed in which the fish have been reared, may slow migrations speeds (Table 3.5.3).

Table 3.5.3. Summary of travel speeds for steelhead smolts for several types of release strategies.

Location	Release Type	Migration Speed (river miles per day)	Source
Cowlitz River	Smolts, onstation	21.3	Harza (1998)
Kalama River	Trucked from facility located within watershed in which fish were released.	4.4	Hulett (pers. comm.)
Bingham Creek	Trucked from facility located outside of watershed in which fish were released.	0.6	Seiler et al (1997)
Stevens Creek	Trucked from facility located outside of watershed in which fish were released.	0.5	Seiler et al (1997)
Snow Creek	Trucked from facility located outside of watershed in which fish were released.	0.4	Seiler et al (1997)

Number Released. Increasing the number of fish released from an artificial production program may increase the risk of predation, although competition between predators for prey may eventually limit the total consumption (Peterman and Gatto 1978).

Predation Marine Environment

WDFW is unaware of any studies that have empirically estimated the predation risks to listed species posed by the program described in this HGMP. NMFS (2002) reviewed existing information on the risks of predation in the marine environment posed by artificial production programs and concluded:

1) Predation by hatchery fish on natural-origin smolts or sub-adults is less likely to occur than predation on fry. Coho and chinook salmon, after entering the marine environment, generally prey upon fish one-half their length or less and consume, on average, fish prey that is less than one-fifth of their length (Brodeur 1991). During early marine life, predation on natural origin chinook, coho, and steelhead will likely be highest in situations where large, yearling-sized hatchery fish encounter sub-yearling fish or fry (SIWG 1984).

2) However, extensive stomach content analysis of coho salmon smolts collected through several studies in marine waters of Puget Sound, Washington do not substantiate any indication of significant predation upon juvenile salmonids (Simenstad and Kinney 1978).

3) Likely reasons for apparent low predation rates on salmon juveniles, including chinook, by larger chinook and other marine predators are described by Cardwell and Fresh (1979). These reasons included: 1) due to rapid growth, fry are better able to elude predators and are accessible to a smaller proportion of predators due to size alone; 2) because fry have dispersed, they are present in low densities relative to other fish and invertebrate prey; and 3) there has either been learning or selection for some predator avoidance.

Competition

WDFW is unaware of any studies that have empirically estimated the competition risks to listed species posed by the program described in this HGMP. Studies conducted in other areas indicate that this program is likely to pose a minimal risk of competition:

1) As discussed above, coho salmon and steelhead released from hatchery programs as smolts typically migrate rapidly downstream. The SIWG (1984) concluded that migrant fish will likely be present for too short a period to compete with resident salmonids.

2) NMFS (2002) noted that ..where interspecific populations have evolved sympatrically, chinook salmon and steelhead have evolved slight differences in habitat use patterns that minimize their interactions with coho salmon (Nilsson 1967; Lister and Genoe 1970; Taylor 1991). Along with the habitat differences exhibited by coho and steelhead, they also show differences in foraging behavior. Peterson (1966) and Johnston (1967) reported that juvenile coho are surface oriented and feed primarily on drifting and flying insects, while steelhead are bottom oriented and feed largely on benthic invertebrates.

3) Flagg et al. (2000) concluded, By definition, hatchery and wild salmonids will not compete unless they require the same limiting resource. Thus, the modern enhancement strategy of releasing salmon and steelhead trout as smolts markedly reduces the potential for hatchery and wild fish to compete for resources in the freshwater rearing environment. Miller (1953), Hochachka (1961), and Reimers (1963), among others, have noted that this potential for competition is further reduced by the fact that many hatchery salmonids have developed different habitat and dietary behavior than wild salmonids. Flagg et al (2000) also stated It is unclear whether or not hatchery and wild chinook salmon utilize similar or different resources in the estuarine environment.

4) Fresh (1997) noted that Few studies have clearly established the role of competition and predation in anadromous population declines, especially in marine habitats. A major reason for the uncertainty in the available data is the complexity and dynamic nature of competition and predation; a small change in one variable (e.g., prey size) significantly changes outcomes of competition and predation. In addition, large data gaps exist in our understanding of these interactions. For instance, evaluating the impact of introduced fishes is impossible because we do not know which nonnative fishes occur in many salmon-producing watersheds. Most available information is circumstantial. While such information can identify where inter- or intra specific relationships may occur, it does not test mechanisms explaining why observed relations exist. Thus, competition and predation are usually one of several plausible hypotheses explaining observed results.

SECTION 4. WATER SOURCE

4.1) Provide a quantitative and narrative description of the water source (spring, well, surface), water quality profile, and natural limitations to production attributable to the water source.

Coho are reared primarily on Kendall Creek water at Kendall Creek. A maximum of 1,600 gpm are used. Rearing at Kendall Creek is conducted under NPDES permit WAG-133007. Kendall Creek is a seasonal stream that goes dry in the summer. When Kendall Creek water is not available the coho are reared on well water that is a constant 47° F. Well water is used for incubation.

4.2) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for the take of listed natural fish as a result of hatchery water withdrawal, screening, or effluent discharge.

The Kendall Creek gravity intake does not have compliant intake screens. These screens are identified for replacement but are a lower priority than others since listed chinook are not passed above the rack on Kendall Creek.

Kendall Creek Hatchery staff conducts effluent monitoring and reporting under the NPDES permit WAG-133007.

SECTION 5. FACILITIES

5.1) Broodstock collection facilities (or methods).

Fish are collected at the Kendall Creek Hatchery holding pond. Returning adults enter the ladder from Kendall Creek and hold in the pond.

5.2) Fish transportation equipment (description of pen, tank truck, or container used).

Broodstock is not transported.

5.3) Broodstock holding and spawning facilities.

Same as 5.1

5.4) Incubation facilities.

Eggs are incubated in vertical incubators using well water.

5.5) Rearing facilities.

Fish are reared in 100' X 10' X 4' and 110' X 20' X 4' raceways.

5.6) Acclimation/release facilities.

Fish are released from raceway ponds

5.7) Describe operational difficulties or disasters that led to significant fish mortality.

None

5.8) Indicate available back-up systems, and risk aversion measures that will be applied, that minimize the likelihood for the take of listed natural fish that may result from equipment failure, water loss, flooding, disease transmission, or other events that could lead to injury or mortality.

The hatchery is staffed full-time and equipped with a low-water alarm system to help prevent catastrophic fish loss resulting from water system failure. At Kendall Creek Hatchery a generator and backup well pumps are available. A Fish Health Specialist monitors the health of the fish and prescribes proper treatment to minimize loss.

SECTION 6. BROODSTOCK ORIGIN AND IDENTITY

Describe the origin and identity of broodstock used in the program, its ESA-listing status, annual collection goals, and relationship to wild fish of the same species/population.

6.1) Source.

Broodstock are collected from coho volunteering to trap at Kendall Creek Hatchery.

6.2) Supporting information.

6.2.1) History.

Native Nooksack coho are the founding broodstock used. However, coho from other North Puget Sound hatchery programs (Soos Cr.?) have been imported and released from Kendall Creek in the past. No other coho have been imported into Kendall Creek for release since 1992.

6.2.2) Annual size.

Currently 706 to 883 adults are needed for broodstock

6.2.3) Past and proposed level of natural fish in broodstock.

All juvenile releases of hatchery coho from Kendall Creek hatchery have been mass marked since the 1996 brood. However, because of the use of the double index coded-wire tag group, specifically the non-adipose fin clipped portion, there has been no differential selection between hatchery and wild fish in the broodstock.

6.2.4) Genetic or ecological differences.

None

6.2.5) Reasons for choosing.

Native stock

6.3) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic or ecological effects to listed natural fish that may occur as a result of broodstock selection practices.

NA

SECTION 7. BROODSTOCK COLLECTION

7.1) Life-history stage to be collected (adults, eggs, or juveniles).

Adults

7.2) Collection or sampling design.

Adults are captured using a weir trap on Kendall Creek as they volunteer in from the NF Nooksack River. They enter the holding pond via a fish ladder. A finger weir is used to keep the adults from escaping the holding pond. Broodstock collection occurs from October to early December.

7.3) Identity.

All coho returning to the facility may potentially be used for broodstock.

7.4) Proposed number to be collected:

7.4.1) Program goal (assuming 1:1 sex ratio for adults):

The program egg take goal is 600,000. Fecundity averages 1,700 eggs per female. The sex ratio for males and females ranges between 50:50 and 60:40. Adults needed range from 706 to 883.

7.4.2) Broodstock collection levels for the last twelve years (e.g. 1988-99), or for most recent years available:

Year	Adults Females	Males	Jacks	Eggs	Juveniles
1988					
1989					
1990					
1991					
1992					
1993					
1994					
1995	2,532	2,086	65	3,211,500	
1996	1,864	1,502	32	2,148,000	
1997	1,536	1,657	81	1,452,500	
1998	839	1,150	6	1,242,000	
1999	445	430	10	700,000	
2000	360	356	4	710,000	
2001	325	325		650,000	

Data source: Kendall Cr. hatchery records

7.5) Disposition of hatchery-origin fish collected in surplus of broodstock needs.

Currently 500 (1:1 sex ratio) adult coho (marked or unmarked) are passed upstream to spawn naturally in Kendall Creek. All other fish are surplused to a buyer, donated to a local food bank or used for nutrient enhancement.

7.6) Fish transportation and holding methods.

No transportation of adults takes place. They are held in the collection/holding pond until spawned.

7.7) Describe fish health maintenance and sanitation procedures applied.

Consistent with Co-Managers Salmonid Disease Control Policy

7.8) Disposition of carcasses.

Spawned carcasses are used by the Nooksack Tribe for a nutrient enhancement program..

7.9) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic or ecological effects to listed natural fish resulting from the broodstock collection program.

No risk to listed fish. Adults are collected at different times.

SECTION 8. MATING

Describe fish mating procedures that will be used, including those applied to meet performance indicators identified previously.

8.1) Selection method.

Adults are selected randomly throughout the entire run time.

8.2) Males.

Males are pooled into groups of 20.

8.3) Fertilization.

The pooled eggs from 20 females is mixed with the pooled sperm from 20 males.

8.4) Cryopreserved gametes.

NA

8.5) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic or ecological effects to listed natural fish resulting from the mating scheme.

NA

SECTION 9. INCUBATION AND REARING -

Specify any management *goals* (e.g. egg to smolt survival) that the hatchery is currently operating under for the hatchery stock in the appropriate sections below. Provide data on the success of meeting the desired hatchery goals.

9.1) Incubation:

9.1.1) Number of eggs taken and survival rates to eye-up and/or ponding.

See 7.4
Green egg to fry survival is 79% to 97% (Avg. 91.17%).

9.1.2) Cause for, and disposition of surplus egg takes.

Surplus eggs are not taken.

9.1.3) Loading densities applied during incubation.

Vertical incubators are used. Flow is 3 gallons per minute for each stack of eight trays. Maximum loading is 8,000 eggs per tray.

9.1.4) Incubation conditions.

Eggs are incubated in well water. The water temperature is a constant 47°F. Dissolved oxygen is monitored and minimum criteria is 8 ppm.

9.1.5) Ponding.

Ponding is forced. Each egg take is monitored using KD factor. The appropriate range is 1.95 - 2.01. This is approximately 1400 temperature units.

9.1.6) Fish health maintenance and monitoring.

Formalin is delivered via drip method from a closed system, to treat eggs for fungus. Dead eggs are removed prior to live eggs hatching. Vexar substrate is used to improve egg development.

9.1.7) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic and ecological effects to listed fish during incubation.

NA

9.2) <u>Rearing</u>:

9.2.1) Provide survival rate data (*average program performance*) by hatchery life stage (fry to fingerling; fingerling to smolt) for the most recent twelve years (1988-99), or for years dependable data are available..

Fry to smolt goal is 90%. Range is 95.9 - 98.2%. Average is 97.2%

9.2.2) Density and loading criteria (goals and actual levels).

Fish are reared at safe flow indexes, less then indicated for the surface water temperature, and density indexes of less than 0.3.

9.2.3) Fish rearing conditions

Fish are reared on Kendall Creek water when available, otherwise well water is used. . Dissolved oxygen is monitored to assure levels are above 8 ppm. Ponds are vacuumed weekly.

9.2.4) Indicate biweekly or monthly fish growth information (*average program performance*), including length, weight, and condition factor data collected during rearing, if available.

Fish are sampled on a weekly basis. Condition factor is determined when the fish are 100 fpp. Lengths are taken at this time and at release.

9.2.5) Indicate monthly fish growth rate and energy reserve data (*average program performance*), if available.

Not available.

9.2.6) Indicate food type used, daily application schedule, feeding rate range (e.g. % B.W./day and lbs/gpm inflow), and estimates of total food conversion efficiency during rearing (*average program performance*).

Fish are started on Moore-Clark Nutra 2000 then switched to Nutra Fry until release. This may change as feed products improve. Feeding rate is 2 to 3% body weight /day.

9.2.7) Fish health monitoring, disease treatment, and sanitation procedures.

Consistent with Co-Managers Salmonid Disease Control Policy

9.2.8) Smolt development indices (e.g. gill ATPase activity), if applicable.

NA

9.2.9) Indicate the use of "natural" rearing methods as applied in the program.

Currently, "natural" rearing conditions are being tested at Kendall Creek hatchery using one pond of the coho production. Differential survivals will be determined.

9.2.10) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic and ecological effects to listed fish under propagation.

NA

SECTION 10. RELEASE

Describe fish release levels, and release practices applied through the hatchery program.

10.1) Proposed fish release levels.

Age Class	Maximum Number	Size (fpp)	Release Date	Location
Eggs				
Unfed Fry				
Fry				
Fingerling				
Yearling	300,000	17	mid-late May	Kendall Creek

'*-177,000 eggs are transferred to various schools and co-ops in the area and planted in various streams. 100,000 of these are transferred to Lynden Christian HS where the resultant fry are released into Fishtrap Creek.

**-5,000 fish are transferred to Squalicum Harbor Net Pens for rearing and release(see Whatcom Creek coho HGMP).

10.2) Specific location(s) of proposed release(s).

Stream, river, or watercourse: Nooksack River (01.0120)

Release point: Kendall Creek (01.0406) at RM 46 with confluence of Nooksack River.

Major watershed: Nooksack River

Basin or Region: Puget Sound

10.3) Actual numbers and sizes of fish released by age class through the program.

Release year	Eggs/ Unfed Fry	Avg size	Fry	Avg size	Fingerling	Avg size	Yearling	Avg size
1988								
1989								
1990								
1991								
1992								
1993								
1994								
1995			2,176,150	1,100			1,190,052	19
1996			1,015,000	1,000			1,089,212	18
1997							1,050,000	19
1998							298,268	17
1999							320,000	18
2000							278,500	17
2001							316,800	17
Average			1,595,575	1,050			648,976	18

Data source: Kendall Creek hatchery records

10.4) Actual dates of release and description of release protocols.

Coho are released mid to late May, during high spring glacial runoff, to encourage quick migration to salt water and to provide visual protection for listed chinook juveniles.

10.5) Fish transportation procedures, if applicable.

None. All fish released on-station

10.6) Acclimation procedures.

These coho are acclimated to Kendall Creek water from ponding to release.

10.7) Marks applied, and proportions of the total hatchery population marked, to identify hatchery adults.

Yearling coho released from Kendall Creek Hatchery are mass marked with an adipose-fin clip. WDFW will adipose-fin clip/coded-wire tag a representative portion of the annual fingerling production (currently 45,000 AD+CWT and 45,000 CWT only "double index group" from Kendall Creek Hatchery) to allow the potential for selective fisheries, the evaluation of fishery contribution, overall survival rates and straying levels to other Puget Sound watersheds.

10.8) Disposition plans for fish identified at the time of release as surplus to programmed or approved levels.

Does not apply.

10.9) Fish health certification procedures applied pre-release.

Fish are monitored by Fish Health Specialist prior to release.

10.10) Emergency release procedures in response to flooding or water system failure.

Flooding is not a problem at Kendall Creek. Water system failure is backed up by generators and creek water.

10.11) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic and ecological effects to listed fish resulting from fish releases.

All yearling coho salmon are released as smolts in mid to late May, during high spring glacial runoff, to encourage them to migrate quickly to salt water and to provide visual protection for listed chinook salmon juveniles.

SECTION 11. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

11.1) Monitoring and evaluation of Performance Indicators presented in Section 1.10.

11.1.1) Describe plans and methods proposed to collect data necessary to respond to each Performance Indicator identified for the program.

The comanagers conduct numerous ongoing monitor programs, including catch, escapement, marking, tagging, and fish health testing. The focus of enhanced monitoring and evaluation programs will be on the risks posed by ecological interactions with listed species. WDFW is proceeding on four tracks:

1) An ongoing research program conducted by Duffy et al. (2002) is assessing the nearshore distribution, size structure, and trophic interactions of juvenile salmon, and potential predators and competitors, in northern and southern Puget Sound. Funding is provided through the federal Hatchery Scientific Review Group.

2) A three year study of the estuarine and early marine use of Sinclair Inlet by juvenile salmonids is nearing completion. The project has four objectives:

a) Assess the spatial and temporal use of littoral habitats by juvenile chinook throughout the time these fish are available in the inlet;

b) Assess the use of offshore (i.e., non-littoral) habitats by juvenile chinook;

c) Determine how long cohorts of juvenile chinook salmon are present in Sinclair inlet;

d) Examine the trophic ecology of juvenile chinook in Sinclair Inlet. This will consist of evaluating the diets of wild chinook salmon and some of their potential predators and competitors. Funding is provided by the USDD-Navy.

3) WDFW is developing the design for a research project to assess the risks of predation on listed species by coho salmon and steelhead released from artificial production programs. Questions which this project will address include:

a) How does trucking and the source of fish (within watershed or out of watershed) affect the migration rate of juvenile steelhead?

b) How many juvenile chinook salmon of natural origin do coho salmon and steelhead consume?

c) What is the rate of residualism of steelhead in Puget Sound rivers?

Funding needs have not yet been quanitifed, but would likely be met through a combination of federal and state sources.

4) WDFW is assisting the Hatchery Scientific Review Group in the development of a template for a regional monitoring plan. The template will provide an integrated assessment of hatchery and wild populations.

11.1.2) Indicate whether funding, staffing, and other support logistics are available or committed to allow implementation of the monitoring and evaluation program.

See Section 11.1.1.

11.2) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse genetic and ecological effects to listed fish resulting from monitoring and evaluation activities.

Risk aversion measures will be developed in conjunction with the monitoring and evaluation plans.

SECTION 12. RESEARCH

12.1) Objective or purpose.

NATURE's Rearing of Kendall Creek Hatchery Coho:

A portion of the hatchery production is being reared using "natural" methods. Survivals will be compared to the normal hatchery production.

12.2) Cooperating and funding agencies.

WDFW and NMFS

12.3) Principle investigator or project supervisor and staff.

James Dixon - WDFW
Des Maynard - NMFS

12.4) Status of stock, particularly the group affected by project, if different than the stock(s) described in Section 2.

Kendall Creek Hatchery Coho - not listed.

12.5) Techniques: include capture methods, drugs, samples collected, tags applied.

Study group and control differentially coded-wire tagged.

12.6) Dates or time period in which research activity occurs.

12.7) Care and maintenance of live fish or eggs, holding duration, transport methods.

NA

12.8) Expected type and effects of take and potential for injury or mortality.

Same as for normal hatchery program - See take table at the end of this HGMP.

12.9) Level of take of listed fish: number or range of fish handled, injured, or killed by sex, age, or size, if not already indicated in Section 2 and the attached take table (Table 1).

Same as for normal hatchery program - See take table at the end of this HGMP.

12.10) Alternative methods to achieve project objectives.

12.11) List species similar or related to the threatened species; provide number and causes of mortality related to this research project.

12.12) Indicate risk aversion measures that will be applied to minimize the likelihood for adverse ecological effects, injury, or mortality to listed fish as a result of the proposed research activities.

There is no increased risk of take over normal hatchery operations as a result of this study.

SECTION 13. ATTACHMENTS AND CITATIONS

Bilby, R.E., B.R. Fransen, and P.A. Bisson. 1996. Incorporation of nitrogen and carbon from spawning coho salmon into the trophic system of small streams: evidence from stable isotopes. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Scit. 53: 164-173.

Brodeur, R. D. 1991. Ontogenetic variations in the type and size of prey consumed by juvenile coho, Oncohynchus kisutch, and chinook, O. tshawytscha, salmon. Environ. Biol. Fishes 30: 303-315.

Cardwell, R.D., and K.L. Fresh. 1979. Predation upon juvenile salmon. Draft technical paper, September 13, 1979. Washington Department of Fisheries. Olympia, Washington.

Flagg, T.A., B.A. Berejikian, J.E. Colt, W.W. Dickhoff, L.W. Harrell, D.J. Maynard, C.E. Nash, M.S. Strom, R.N. Iwamoto, and C.V.W. Mahnken. 2000. Ecological and behavioral impacts of artificial production strategies on the abundance of wild salmon populations. U.S. Dept. Commer., NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-NWFSC-41: 92p.

Fresh, K.L. 1997. The role of competition and predation in the decline of Pacific salmon and steelhead. *In* D.J. Stouder, P.A. Bisson, and R.J. Naiman (editors), Pacific salmon and their ecosystems: status and future options, p. 245-275. Chapman Hall, New York.

Gregory, S.V., G.A. Lamberti, D.C. Erman, K.V. Koski, M.L. Murphy, and J.R. Sedell. 1987. Influence of forest practices on aquatic production. *In* E.O. Salo and T.W. Cundy (editors), Streamside management: forestry and fishery interactions. Institute of Forest Resources, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington.

Griffith, J., R. Rogers, J. Drotts, and P. Stevenson. 2001. 2001 Stillaguamish River smolt trapping project. Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, Arlington, Washington.

Griffith, J., R. Rogers, J. Drotts, and P. Stevenson. 2003. 2002 Stillaguamish River smolt trapping project. Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, Arlington, Washington.

Harza. 1999. The 1997 and 1998 technical study reports, Cowlitz River Hydroelectric Project. Vol 2, pp 35-42.

Hochachka, P.W. 1961. Liver glycogen reserves of interacting resident and introduced trout populations. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 48: 125-135.

Johnston, J.M. 1967. Food and feeding habits of juvenile coho salmon and steelhead trout in Worthy Creek, Washington. Master s thesis, University of Washington, Seattle.

Kline, T.C., J.J. Goring, Q.A. Mathisen, and P.H. Poe. 1997. Recycling of elements transported upstream by runs of Pacific salmon: I ÿÿ^{15}N and ÿÿ^{13}C evidence in Sashin Creek, southeastern Alaska. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 47: 136-144.

Levy, S. 1997. Pacific salmon bring it all back home. BioScience 47: 657-660.

Lister, D.B., and H.S. Genoe. 1970. Stream habitat utilization by cohabiting underyearlings of chinook (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) and coho (O. kisutch) in the Big Qualicum River, British Columbia. J. Fish. Res. Board. Can. 27: 1215-1224.

Marlowe, C., B. Freymond, R.W. Rogers, and G. Volkhardt. 2001. Dungeness River chinook salmon rebuilding project: progress report 1993-1998. Report FPA 00-24. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Mathisen, O.A., P.L. Parker, J.J. Goering, T.C. Kline, P.H. Poe, and R.S. Scalan. 1988. Recycling of marine elements transported into freshwater systems by anadromous salmon. Verh. Int. Ver. Limnol. 23: 2249-2258.

Miller, R.B. 1953. Comparative survival of wild and hatchery-reared cutthroat trout in a stream. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 83: 120-130.

NMFS (National Marine Fisheries Service). 2002. Biological opinion on artificial propagation in the Hood Canal and eastern Strait of Juan de Fuca regions of Washington State. National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Region.

Nilsson, N.A. 1967. Interactive segregation between fish species. *In* The biological basis for freshwater fish production. *Edited by* S.D. Gerking. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford. pp. 295-313.

Pearsons, T.N., G.A. McMichael, K.D. Ham, E.L. Bartrand, A. l. Fritts, and C. W. Hopley. 1998. Yakima River species interactions studies. Progress report 1995-1997 submitted to Bonneville Power Administration, Portland, Oregon. DOE/BP-64878-6.

Peterman, R.M., and M. Gatto. 1978. Estimation of the functional responses of predators on juvenile salmon. J. Fish. Res. Board Can. 35: 797-808.

Peterson, G.R. 1966. The relationship of invertebrate drift abundance to the standing crop of benthic drift abundance to the standing crop of benthic organisms in a small stream. Master s thesis, Univ. of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Reimers, N. 1963. Body condition, water temperature, and over-winter survival of hatchery reared trout in Convict Creek, California. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 92: 39-46.

Samarin, P., and T. Sebastian. 2002. Salmon smolt catch by a rotary screwtrap operated in the Puyallup River: 2002. Puyallup Indian Tribe.

Seidel, Paul, 1983, Spawning Guidelines for Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Hatcheries, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia

Seiler, D., P. Hanratty, S. Neuhauser, P. Topping, M. Ackley, and L.E. Kishimoto. 1997. Wild salmon production and survival evaluation. Annual Report. RAD 97-03. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., L. Kishimoto, and S. Neuhauser. 1998. 1997 Skagit River wild 0+ chinook production evaluation. Contract report to Seattle City Light. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., L. Kishimoto, and S. Neuhauser. 1999. 1998 Skagit River wild 0+ chinook production evaluation. Contract report to Seattle City Light. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., L. Kishimoto, and S. Neuhauser. 2000. 1999 Skagit River wild 0+ chinook production evaluation. Contract report to Seattle City Light. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., L. Kishimoto, and S. Neuhauser. 2001. 2000 Skagit River wild 0+ chinook production evaluation. Contract report to Seattle City Light. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., L. Kishimoto, and S. Neuhauser. 2002. 2001 Skagit River wild 0+ chinook production evaluation. Contract report to Seattle City Light. Report FPA 02-11. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., G. Volkhardt, and L. Kishimoto. 2003. Evaluation of downstream migrant salmon production in 1999 and 2000 from three Lake Washington tributaries: Cedar River, Bear Creek, and Issaquah Creek. Report FPA 02-07. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Seiler, D., G. Volkhardt, L. Kishimoto, and P. Topping. 2002. 2000 Green River juvenile salmonid production evaluation. Report FPT 02-03. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Simenstad, C.A., and W.J. Kinney. 1978. Trophic relationships of out-migrating chum salmon in Hood Canal, Washington, 1977. Univ. of Washington, Fish. Res. Inst., Final Rep., FRI-UW-8026.

Slaney, P.A., B.R. Ward. 1993. Experimental fertilization of nutrient deficient streams in British Columbia. *In* G. Schooner and S. Asselin (editors), Le developpmente du saumon Atlantique au Quebec: connaitre les regles du jeu pour reussir. Colloque international e la Federation quebecoise pour le saumon atlantique, p. 128-141. Quebec, decembre 1992. Collection *Salmo salar* n°1.

Slaney, P.A., B.R. Ward, and J.C. Wightman. 2003. Experimental nutrient addition to the Keogh River and application to the Salmon River in coastal British Columbia. *In* J.G. Stockner,(editor), Nutrients in salmonid ecosystems: sustaining production and biodiversity, p. 111-126. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 34, Bethesda, Maryland.

SIWG (Species Interaction Work Group). 1984. Evaluation of potential species interaction effects in the planning and selection of salmonid enhancement projects. J. Rensel, chairman and K. Fresh, editor. Report prepared for the Enhancement Planning Team for implementation of the Salmon and Steelhead Conservation and Enhancement Act of 1980. Washington Department of Fisheries. Olympia, WA. 80pp.

Stockner, J. G., editor. 2003. Nutrients in salmonid ecosystems: sustaining production and biodiversity. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 34, Bethesda, Maryland.

Taylor, E.B. 1991. A review of local adaptation in Salmonidae with particular reference to Pacific and Atlantic salmon. Aquaculture 98: pp. 185-207.

USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 1994. Biological assessment for operation of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service operated or funded hatcheries in the Columbia River Basin in 1995-1998. Submitted to National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) under cover letter, dated August 2, 1994, from William F. Shake, Acting USFWS Regional Director, to Brian Brown, NMFS.

United States v. Washington, No. 9213 Phase 1 (sub no. 85-2) Order Adopting Puget Sound Management Plan, 1985.

Ward, B.R., D.J.F. McCubbing, and P.A. Slaney. 2003. Evaluation of the addition of inorganic nutrients and stream habitat structures in the Keogh River watershed for steelhead trout and coho salmon. . *In* J.G. Stockner,(editor), Nutrients in salmonid ecosystems: sustaining production and biodiversity, p. 127-147. American Fisheries Society, Symposium 34, Bethesda, Maryland.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and Washington Treaty Indian Tribes. 1998. Salmonid Disease Control Policy of the Fisheries Co-Managers of Washington State. Olympia.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife and Washington Treaty Indian Tribes. 1999. Current Brood Document.

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. 1996. State of Washington Fish Health Manual. Hatcheries Program, Fish Health Division. Olympia.

Wipfli, M.S., J. Hudson, and J. Caouette. 1998 Influence of salmon carcasses on stream productivity: response of biofilm and benthic macroinvertebrates in southeastern Alaska, U.S.A. Can J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 55: 1503-1511.

SECTION 14. CERTIFICATION LANGUAGE AND SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE PARTY

I hereby certify that the foregoing information is complete, true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief. I understand that the information provided in this HGMP is submitted for the purpose of receiving limits from take prohibitions specified under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C.1531-1543) and regulations promulgated thereafter for the proposed hatchery program, and that any false statement may subject me to the criminal penalties of 18 U.S.C. 1001, or penalties provided under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

Name, Title, and Signature of Applicant:

Certified by_____ Date:_____

Table 1. Estimated listed salmonid take levels of by hatchery activity.

Listed species affected: Chinook ESU/Population: Puget Sound Activity: Hatchery Operations - Coho program				
Location of hatchery activity: Kendall Creek Dates of activity: October-September Hatchery program operator: WDFW				
Type of Take	**Annual Take of Listed Fish By Life Stage *(Number of Fish)***			
	Egg/Fry	Juvenile/Smolt	Adult	Carcass
Observe or harass a)				
Collect for transport b)				
Capture, handle, and release c)				
Capture, handle, tag/mark/tissue sample, and release d)				
Removal (e.g. broodstock) e)				
Intentional lethal take f)				
Unintentional lethal take g)	Unknown	Unknown		
Other Take (specify) h)				

a. Contact with listed fish through stream surveys, carcass and mark recovery projects, or migrational delay at weirs.
b. Take associated with weir or trapping operations where listed fish are captured and transported for release.
c. Take associated with weir or trapping operations where listed fish are captured, handled and released upstream or downstream.
d. Take occurring due to tagging and/or bio-sampling of fish collected through trapping operations prior to upstream or downstream release, or through carcass recovery programs.
e. Listed fish removed from the wild and collected for use as broodstock.
f. Intentional mortality of listed fish, usually as a result of spawning as broodstock.
g. Unintentional mortality of listed fish, including loss of fish during transport or holding prior to spawning or prior to release into the wild, or, for integrated programs, mortalities during incubation and rearing.
h. Other takes not identified above as a category.

Instructions:

1. An entry for a fish to be taken should be in the take category that describes the greatest impact.
2. Each take to be entered in the table should be in one take category only (there should not be more than one entry for the same sampling event).
3. If an individual fish is to be taken more than once on separate occasions, each take must be entered in the take table.